

Some methods for solution of quantum detection and measurement problems*

B. A. Grishanin[†]

*International Laser Center and Department of Physics
M. V. Lomonosov Moscow State University, 119899 Moscow, Russia
(January 29, 2003)*

I. INTRODUCTION

The problem of detection and measurement optimization at the output of a quantum communication channel, under its modern interpretation [1], can be described in the following manner.

Let a quantum channel $\{H, \hat{\rho}(\lambda)\}$ is given. Here H is the Hilbert space where the operators are defined, which represent (in accordance with the basic principles of quantum theory) the quantum observables of the channel output; $\hat{\rho}(\lambda)$ is the density matrix, which represents the quantum state of the output observables and depends on input classical observables $\lambda \in \Lambda$. The same way as in the classical decision theory [2] a set $\tilde{\Lambda}$ of the possible decisions $\tilde{\lambda}$, which are represented now by a final result of some quantum measurement procedure γ . The problem is to find an optimal procedure γ in the standard sense of the decision theory. The latter means that the optimization quality is represented by a conditional risk function

$$r(\gamma|\lambda) = \int c(\lambda, \tilde{\lambda}) \mathcal{P}_\gamma(d\tilde{\lambda}|\lambda), \quad (1)$$

where $c(\lambda, \tilde{\lambda})$ is the “cost” (pay) function and $\mathcal{P}_\gamma(d\tilde{\lambda}|\lambda)$ is the conditional probability distribution depending on the procedure γ and the conditional channel output state $\hat{\rho}(\lambda)$.

We suggest the following representation (modified with respect to [1]) of the measurement procedure. In accordance with the axioms of quantum theory, a direct quantum measurement of any physical observables represented with a commuting set of operators $\hat{\Theta}$, which are defined in the tensor product $H \otimes H'$ of the given space H and any additional auxiliary space H' . The latter introduces some channel-independent quantum system with an arbitrary density matrix $\hat{\rho}'$, so that the joint density matrix of the output and the auxiliary subsystems takes the form $\hat{\rho}(\lambda) \otimes \hat{\rho}'$. We call this indirect measurement. Directly measured variables $\hat{\Theta}$ yield spectral values $\tilde{\lambda} \in \tilde{\Lambda}$, which represents the decisions of interest. In accordance with the quantum measurement postulates, we get

$$\mathcal{P}_\gamma(d\tilde{\lambda}|\lambda) = \text{Tr} [\hat{\rho}(\lambda) \otimes \hat{\rho}'] \hat{E}(d\tilde{\lambda}), \quad (2)$$

where $\hat{E}$ is an orthogonal decomposition of unit [3] for operators

$$\hat{\Theta} = \int_{\tilde{\Lambda}} \tilde{\lambda} \hat{E}(d\tilde{\lambda}).$$

Performing in Eq. (2) an averaging over the auxiliary system, we get

$$\mathcal{P}_\gamma(d\tilde{\lambda}|\lambda) = \text{Tr} \hat{\rho}(\lambda) \hat{\mathcal{E}}(d\tilde{\lambda}), \quad (3)$$

where

$$\hat{\mathcal{E}}(d\tilde{\lambda}) = \text{Tr}_{H'} \hat{E}(d\tilde{\lambda}) \hat{\rho}' \quad (4)$$

is the quantum decision function which determines statistical properties of the measurement results. It is the quantum analogue of the randomized decision function, that is conditional probability measure $\mu(d\tilde{\lambda}|y)$, where y are the classical

*Translation of the original Russian paper: B. A. Grishanin, *Tekhnicheskaya Kibernetika*, **11** (5), pp. 127–137 (1973), submitted 18 January 1972.

[†]grishan@comsim1.phys.msu.su

output observables. Here Eq. (3) is analogous to the classical formula $\mathcal{P}(d\tilde{\lambda}|\lambda) = \int \mu(d\tilde{\lambda}|y)\mathcal{P}(dy|\lambda)$. In contrast to μ , Eq. (4) defines an operator self-adjoint measure (non-orthogonal, or generalized, decomposition of unit [3]) obeying the positivity and normalization conditions:

$$\hat{\mathcal{E}}(\cdot) \geq 0, \quad \int \hat{E}(d\tilde{\lambda}) = \hat{I}. \quad (5)$$

Thus, optimization over the possible setting $(H', \hat{\rho}', \hat{\Theta})$ is reduced to optimization over $\hat{\mathcal{E}}$. A similar approach to the problems of quantum mathematical statistics is developed in [4], which appeared after the submission of this paper; the main results of this paper had been presented in [5].

Here only the Bayes type of optimization problems is under study, where an a priori probability distribution $\mathcal{P}(d\lambda)$ is known and average risk takes the form

$$\mathcal{R} = \int r(\gamma|\lambda) \mathcal{P}(d\lambda).$$

Substituting here expressions (1), (3) and introducing operators of the quantum a posteriori risk

$$\hat{R}(\tilde{\lambda}) = \int c(\lambda, \tilde{\lambda}) \hat{\rho}(\lambda) \mathcal{P}(\lambda) \quad (6)$$

(which is an analogue of the product $R(\tilde{\lambda}|y)\mathcal{P}(dy)$ of the classical a posteriori risk and the output observables y probability distribution), we arrive at the minimization problem

$$\mathcal{R}(\hat{\mathcal{E}}) = \text{Tr} \int \hat{R}(\tilde{\lambda}) \hat{\mathcal{E}}(d\tilde{\lambda}) = \min_{\hat{\mathcal{E}}} \quad (7)$$

the solution of which is the optimal decision function $\hat{\mathcal{E}}_0$.

In this paper the analysis of the possible methods to get the solution of the problem (7) is presented. For gaussian channels, for the cases of so called “simple” and quadratic cost functions the optimal decision functions $\hat{\mathcal{E}}_0$ and the corresponding optimal measurement procedures are obtained. The most attention is paid to the gaussian density matrices

$$\hat{\rho}(\lambda) = \exp[\Gamma - (\hat{x} - \lambda)^T Q (\hat{x} - \lambda)], \quad (8)$$

where $\hat{x}^T = (\hat{x}_1, \dots, \hat{x}_s)$ is a given vector of operators in the H space with a non-degenerate (only for simplicity of discussion) c -number commutation matrix:

$$[\hat{x}_i, \hat{x}_j^T] = (\hat{x}_i \hat{x}_j - \hat{x}_j \hat{x}_i) = C \hat{I}, \quad (i, j = 1, \dots, s); \quad (9)$$

$Q > 0$ — a given definitely positive symmetric matrix;

$$\Gamma = \ln \det^{1/2} |2 \sinh(\sqrt{Q} C \sqrt{Q})| \quad (10)$$

is the normalization constant. On the base of Eqs. (8), (9) the correlation matrix can be calculated as

$$K = \left(\frac{1}{2} \text{Tr} [(\hat{x}_i - \lambda_i)(\hat{x}_j - \lambda_j) + (\hat{x}_j - \lambda_j)(\hat{x}_i - \lambda_i)] \hat{\rho}(\lambda) \right) = \frac{1}{2} C \coth QC. \quad (11)$$

Gaussian density matrices arise at the investigation of the thermodynamically equilibrium linear physical systems with a Hamiltonian $\mathcal{H}(\lambda)$ (that is a total energy represented in terms of coordinates and momenta), which is quadratic with coordinates and momenta, i.e. corresponds to a collection of linear oscillators. Typical examples are given by vibrational circuits, electromagnetic fields in lines, waveguides and free space. Parameters λ in (8) for the most typical examples correspond to a non-quantum displacement, due to the presence of a classical signal at their input. Gibbs distribution [6] $\hat{\rho} = \exp(\Gamma - \hat{\mathcal{H}}/kT)$ for such systems yields density matrix of the form (8).

II. METHOD OF THE SHIFTED A'POSTERIORI RISK

If the family R of the a'posteriori risk operators is representable in the form

$$\hat{R}(\tilde{\lambda}) = \hat{\tilde{R}}(\tilde{\lambda}) + \hat{A}, \quad (12)$$

where operator $\hat{A}$ does not depend on $\tilde{\lambda}$, then the minimization problem is equivalent to minimization

$$\int \text{Tr } \hat{\tilde{R}}(\tilde{\lambda}) \hat{\mathcal{E}}(d\tilde{\lambda}) = \min_{\hat{\mathcal{E}}} \quad (13)$$

for the same constraints on $\hat{\mathcal{E}}$. Such replacement of the minimization problems takes place when the cost function is represented in the form

$$c(\lambda, \tilde{\lambda}) = \tilde{c}(\lambda, \tilde{\lambda}) + c_0(\lambda). \quad (14)$$

Then the corresponding operators $\hat{\tilde{R}}(\tilde{\lambda})$, $\hat{A}$ can be expressed via $\tilde{c}, c_0$ with a help of Eq. (6).

If the “shifted” family $\tilde{R}$ is commutative, then all operators $\hat{\tilde{R}}(\tilde{\lambda})$ can be represented as functions of some commutative set of operators $\hat{y}$. Then the solution of the problem (13) is easy to obtain in the form

$$\hat{\mathcal{E}}_0(d\tilde{\lambda}) = \delta(d\tilde{\lambda}, \tilde{\lambda}_0(\hat{y})), \quad (15)$$

where the scalar function is the indicator function of the subset e :

$$\delta(e, x) = \begin{cases} 0, & x \notin e, \\ 1, & x \in e; \end{cases} \quad (16)$$

$\tilde{\lambda}_0(\hat{y})$ — scalar function obtained after minimization with $\tilde{\lambda}$ the matrix elements $\tilde{R}_{yy}$ of the operators $\hat{\tilde{R}}(\tilde{\lambda})$ at the y -representation. The corresponding measurement procedure is given then by direct quantum measurement of the variables $\tilde{\lambda}_0(\hat{y})$, as far as Eq. (15) is an orthogonal expansion of unit for the $\tilde{\lambda}_0(\hat{y})$ operators. As far as $\tilde{\lambda}_0(\hat{y})$ are commutative, the decision function (15) can be interpreted as a singular probability distribution of the classical type $\mu(d\tilde{\lambda}|\tilde{\lambda}_0) = \delta(d\tilde{\lambda}, \tilde{\lambda}_0)$ and the corresponding measurement as a non-randomized one. Keeping in mind that any orthogonal expansion may be written in the form of Eq. (15), we see that any direct measurement is a quantum analogue of a non-randomized one. Conversely, the indirect measurement can be called randomized. In the quantum case, in contrast to classical Bayes problems, randomization is always necessary when the useful information is associated with non-commuting observables and their direct measurement is impossible.

It is easy to prove, that in the problem of choosing of one of the two possible decisions $\tilde{\lambda} = \tilde{\lambda}_1$ or $\tilde{\lambda} = \tilde{\lambda}_2$ it is ever possible to find operator $\hat{A}$ to fit the demand of commutativity of the shifted risk operators $\hat{\tilde{R}}(\tilde{\lambda})$. Hence, in these kind of problems the optimum is ever found on the non-randomized — direct measurements [1]. In all other cases, for non-commutative $\hat{R}(\lambda)$, it is the most probable that the above method is incapable to provide the commutative shifted risk operators $\hat{\tilde{R}}(\tilde{\lambda})$. Nevertheless, as it will be shown at Sec. 4, this method may be useful in combination with the other methods, which may happen effective in the transformed problem (13).

III. METHOD OF A LOWER BOUNDARY

The general sketch of this method is as follows. The minimal average risk $\mathcal{R}(\hat{\mathcal{E}})$ is replaced by some lower boundary $\mathcal{R}_0(\hat{\mathcal{E}}) \leq \mathcal{R}(\hat{\mathcal{E}})$. For $\mathcal{R}_0(\hat{\mathcal{E}})$ a class Σ of the decision functions $\hat{\mathcal{E}}$, which minimize $\mathcal{R}_0(\hat{\mathcal{E}})$, is determined:

$$\mathcal{R}_0(\hat{\mathcal{E}}) = \min \mathcal{R}_0(\hat{\mathcal{E}}).$$

If this class Σ contains at least one decision function $\hat{\mathcal{E}}_0$ which fits the condition

$$\mathcal{R}(\hat{\mathcal{E}}_0) = \mathcal{R}_0(\hat{\mathcal{E}}_0),$$

then $\hat{\mathcal{E}}_0$ is the solution of the minimization problem (7), as $\mathcal{R}(\hat{\mathcal{E}}_0) \leq \mathcal{R}(\hat{\mathcal{E}})$ for all $\hat{\mathcal{E}}$.

One of the simplest lower boundaries is

$$\mathcal{R}_0(\hat{\mathcal{E}}) = \int r(\tilde{\lambda}) \text{Tr } \hat{\mathcal{E}}(\tilde{\lambda}), \quad (17)$$

where $r(\tilde{\lambda})$ are the minimal eigen values of the risks $\hat{R}(\tilde{\lambda})$. For the corresponding eigen projectors we have

$$\hat{R}(\tilde{\lambda})\hat{P}(\tilde{\lambda}) = r(\tilde{\lambda})\hat{P}(\tilde{\lambda}). \quad (18)$$

At deduction of Eq. (17) the inequality $\text{Tr} [\hat{R}(\tilde{\lambda}) - r(\tilde{\lambda})\hat{I}]\hat{\mathcal{E}}(\tilde{\lambda}) \geq 0$ is used. For example, if all operators $\hat{R}(\tilde{\lambda})$ are unitary equivalent all the $r(\tilde{\lambda}) = r_0$ are equal. Then with use of Eq. (17) for a finite-dimension space H we get an optimal operator measure $\hat{\mathcal{E}}_0$ in the form of

$$\hat{\mathcal{E}}_0(d\tilde{\lambda}) = \hat{P}(\tilde{\lambda})\nu(d\tilde{\lambda}), \quad (19)$$

if only the positive c -number measure ν fits the normalization condition given by the second relation in Eqs. (5). In the case of infinite-dimension space H the risk would be infinite, so this case is of no interest. To the latter situation the below discussed problem is simplified.

Let there is a Bayes problem with the simple cost function $c(\lambda, \tilde{\lambda}) = -\delta(\lambda - \tilde{\lambda})$ ($\Lambda = \tilde{\Lambda}$ are s -dimensional Euclid spaces), gaussian family $\hat{\rho}(\lambda)$ described by Eqs. (8)–(11) and infinitely wide a’priori distribution $p(\lambda) = d\mathcal{P}/d\lambda$. Corresponding a’posteriori risk operators (6) are of the form

$$\hat{R}(\tilde{\lambda}) = -p(\tilde{\lambda})\hat{\rho}(\tilde{\lambda}). \quad (20)$$

Let us show that in this problem the optimal measure $\hat{\mathcal{E}}_0$ is given in the form (19) with

$$\nu(d\tilde{\lambda}) = \frac{d\tilde{\lambda}}{\det^{1/2}|2\pi C|}, \quad (21)$$

and $\hat{P}(\tilde{\lambda})$ are given by the eigen projectors corresponding to the maximal eigen value μ_0 of the density matrices $\hat{\rho}(\lambda)$:

$$\hat{\rho}(\tilde{\lambda})\hat{P}(\tilde{\lambda}) = \mu_0\hat{P}(\tilde{\lambda}). \quad (22)$$

Now let us divide the space $\tilde{\Lambda} = \Lambda \ni \lambda$ into regions Λ_i , which on the one hand have the dimension small enough to neglect the dependence of $p(\lambda)$ on λ and on the other hand unlimitedly expand with expansion of the $p(\lambda)$ function. Then on account of Eq. (20) we can represent risk (7) in the form

$$\mathcal{R}(\hat{\mathcal{E}}) = - \sum_i p(\lambda_i) \int_{\Lambda_i} \text{Tr } \hat{\rho}(\lambda) \hat{\mathcal{E}}(d\lambda). \quad (23)$$

For fixed i a’posteriori risks $R_i(\lambda) = -p(\lambda_i)\hat{\rho}(\lambda)$ in the right side of Eq. (23) are now unitary equivalent. For the subsequent analysis the following asymptotic property is essential for the family of operators $\hat{\rho}(\lambda)$ with $\lambda \in \tilde{\Lambda}_i = \Lambda_i \setminus \delta\Lambda_i$, that is λ belongs to the internal region $\tilde{\Lambda}_i$ got by subtraction of a small boundary region $\delta\Lambda_i$, the latter unlimitedly expanding with $p(\lambda)$ but having a zero relative volume with respect to the one of Λ_i . For any in advance given precision these families may be supposed to act non-trivially only in the subspaces $\Phi_i(\varepsilon) \subset H$, $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, beyond which, due to relation $\|\hat{\rho}(\lambda)\psi\| \leq \varepsilon\|\psi\|$, it is acceptable to set $\hat{\rho}(\lambda)\psi = 0$. That is for unlimited expansion of the regions Λ_i , $\delta\Lambda_i$, $\tilde{\Lambda}_i$ the subspaces Φ_i are asymptotically orthogonal to each other with any unlimitedly high precision given by ε . As it is shown in Appendix A, for the discussed family $\hat{\rho}(\lambda)$ the orthoprojectors $\hat{P}_i$ onto the introduced above subspaces Φ_i can be represented in the form

$$\hat{P}_i = \int_{\tilde{\Lambda}_i} \hat{P}(\lambda) \frac{d\lambda}{\det^{1/2}|2\pi C|}, \quad (24)$$

and their dimensionality is $N_i = \text{Tr } \hat{P}_i = \det^{-1/2}|2\pi C|V(\tilde{\Lambda}_i)$ (V — the corresponding phase subspace volume).

Taking into account equation $\hat{\rho}(\lambda) = \hat{P}_i\hat{\rho}(\lambda)\hat{P}_i$, arising from the above discussion for $\lambda \in \tilde{\Lambda}_i$, and neglecting small boundary regions $\delta\Lambda_i$, the terms of the sum (23) can be rewritten as

$$\mathcal{R}_i(\hat{\mathcal{E}}_i) = -p(\lambda_i) \int_{\tilde{\Lambda}_i} \text{Tr} \hat{\rho}(\lambda) \hat{\mathcal{E}}_i(d\lambda), \quad (25)$$

where $\hat{\mathcal{E}}_i$ are the measure $\hat{\mathcal{E}}$ projection onto Φ_i fitting the normalization condition

$$\int_{\tilde{\Lambda}_i} \hat{\mathcal{E}}_i(d\lambda) = \hat{P}_i. \quad (26)$$

Due to the asymptotic orthogonality of Φ_i , measures $\hat{\mathcal{E}}_i$ are independent decompositions of operators $\hat{P}_i$ in Φ_i , so minimization of Eq. (23) over $\hat{\mathcal{E}}$ is equivalent to minimization of Eq. (25) over $\hat{\mathcal{E}}_i$.

To perform this minimization let us make use of solution (19) with measure ν of the form (21) taking into account that in accordance with (24) it fits the normalization condition (26). On additional account of independence of measure (21) on i this solution (19) defines the optimal measure $\hat{\mathcal{E}}_0$ in the total space of $\tilde{\lambda}$ values, so that asymptotically $\hat{\mathcal{E}}_0 \rightarrow \bigoplus_i \hat{\mathcal{E}}_i$.

Taking into account Eqs. (20) and (22) we get from Eq. (18)

$$r(\lambda) = -p(\lambda)\mu_0, \quad (27)$$

and for the average risk from (17) or (20),

$$\mathcal{R}(\hat{\mathcal{E}}_0) = - \int p(\lambda)\mu_0 \frac{d\tilde{\lambda}}{\det^{1/2}|2\pi C|} = - \frac{\mu_0}{\det^{1/2}|2\pi C|}. \quad (28)$$

Applying then the zero-temperature method presented in Appendix A it is easy to calculate

$$\mu_0 = \exp \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr} \left[\ln |2 \sinh QC| + |QC| \right] \right\}. \quad (29)$$

Correspondingly, from Eq. (28) and (29) for $C \rightarrow 0$ we get the classical limit $\mathcal{R} = -\det^{1/2}(Q/\pi)$.

IV. METHOD OF REDUCING OF THE A'POSTERIORI RISK OPERATORS TO A FAMILY OF UNITARY EQUIVALENT OPERATORS

In some problems the a'posteriori risks operators may be not unitary equivalent, as it was in Sec. III, but with use of replacement (12) it is possible to get such a representation for the displaced average risk $\hat{\mathcal{R}}(\hat{\mathcal{E}}) = \mathcal{R}(\hat{\mathcal{E}}) - \text{Tr} \hat{A}$, that the method of a lower boundary would be applicable.

Let us discuss the case of quadratic cost function

$$c(\lambda, \tilde{\lambda}) = (\tilde{\lambda} - \lambda)^T (\tilde{\lambda} - \lambda) \quad (30)$$

(it is no demand to introduce a more general quadratic form, as it is always can be reduced to this one). For this case

$$\hat{R}(\tilde{\lambda}) = \int (\lambda - \tilde{\lambda})^T (\lambda - \tilde{\lambda}) \hat{\rho}(\lambda) \mathcal{P}(d\lambda). \quad (31)$$

Let us denote

$$\hat{\hat{\rho}} = \int \hat{\rho}(\lambda) \mathcal{P}(d\lambda) \quad (32)$$

and find such operators $\hat{u}$, that Eq. (31) is reduced to

$$\hat{R}(\tilde{\lambda}) = \hat{\hat{\rho}}^{1/2} (\hat{u} - \tilde{\lambda})^T (\hat{u} - \tilde{\lambda}) \hat{\hat{\rho}}^{1/2} + \hat{A}, \quad (33)$$

where $\hat{A}$ does not depend on $\tilde{\lambda}$. It is easy to confirm that these operators are the operators of the a'posteriori mathematical expectation of variables λ :

$$\hat{u} = \int \lambda \hat{F}(d\lambda), \quad (34)$$

where

$$\hat{F}(d\lambda) = \hat{\rho}^{-1/2} \hat{\rho}(\lambda) \hat{\rho}^{1/2} \mathcal{P}(d\lambda)$$

is a non-orthogonal decomposition of unit having a meaning of a specific quantum a'posteriori probability distribution of variables λ . Note, that here introduced analogues of classical a'posteriori characteristics are not unique (e.g. see [7]) and the adequate form depends on a specific problem.

Operator $\hat{A}$ corresponding to operators (34) in Eq. (33) is equal to

$$\hat{A} = \int \lambda^T \lambda \hat{\rho}(\lambda) \mathcal{P}(d\lambda) - \hat{\rho}^{1/2} \hat{u}^T \hat{u} \hat{\rho}^{1/2} \quad (35)$$

and the corresponding risk is

$$\mathcal{R}_A = \text{Tr } \hat{A} = \text{Tr } (K_\lambda - \tilde{K}_u),$$

where K_λ is a'priori correlation matrix of variables λ , for which the equality $M\lambda = 0$ is suggested; $\tilde{K}_u$ denotes the condition-less correlation matrix of $\hat{u}$ depending on the condition-less density matrix (32).

This way obtained operators of the shifted risk

$$\hat{\tilde{R}}(\tilde{\lambda}) = \hat{\rho}^{1/2} (\hat{u} - \lambda)^T (\hat{u} - \lambda) \hat{\rho}^{1/2}$$

are not unitary equivalent. Although, if in equation $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}(\hat{\tilde{\mathcal{E}}}) = \text{Tr } \hat{\tilde{R}}(\tilde{\lambda}) \hat{\tilde{\mathcal{E}}}(d\tilde{\lambda})$ for the average risk we substitute

$$\hat{\rho}^{1/2} \hat{\mathcal{E}}(d\tilde{\lambda}) \hat{\rho}^{1/2} = \hat{\tilde{\mathcal{E}}}(d\tilde{\lambda}), \quad (36)$$

then it reduces to

$$\tilde{\mathcal{R}}(\hat{\tilde{\mathcal{E}}}) = \text{Tr } \int (\hat{u} - \tilde{\lambda})^T (\hat{u} - \tilde{\lambda}) \hat{\tilde{\mathcal{E}}}(d\tilde{\lambda}), \quad (37)$$

where $\hat{\tilde{\mathcal{E}}}$ is a new positive measure normalized the following way

$$\int \hat{\tilde{\mathcal{E}}} = \hat{\rho} \quad (38)$$

instead of the second equality in Eq. (5). For the gaussian density matrix (8) and gaussian $\mathcal{P}(d\lambda)$ we have

$$\hat{\rho} = \exp(\tilde{\Gamma} - \hat{x}^T \tilde{Q} \hat{x})$$

with $\tilde{Q} = (1/2)C^{-1} \coth^{-1}[2(K + K_\lambda)C^{-1}]$. At this from Eq. (34) we get

$$\hat{u} = V \hat{x} = K_\lambda (K + K_\lambda)^{-1} \cosh(C\tilde{Q}) \hat{x}.$$

Making use of operators $\hat{u}_0 = K_\lambda (K + K_\lambda)^{-1} \hat{x}$, which determine the optimal operator estimates with no account of the commutativity condition [7], we represent this expression in the form

$$\hat{u} = \cosh C_0 \tilde{Q}_0 \hat{u}_0,$$

where $C_0 = K_\lambda (K + K_\lambda)^{-1} C (K + K_\lambda)^{-1} K_\lambda$, $\tilde{Q}_0 = [(K + K_\lambda)^{-1} K_\lambda]^{-1} \tilde{Q} [K_\lambda (K + K_\lambda)^{-1}]^{-1}$ are, correspondingly, the commutator of the variables $\hat{u}_0$ and the responding to it Q -matrix in the expression $\hat{\rho} = \exp(\tilde{\Gamma} - \hat{u}_0^T \tilde{Q}_0 \hat{u}_0)$ for the transformed gaussian density matrix of the output state.

As a result of the presented transformations, for the multiplier of $\hat{\tilde{\mathcal{E}}}$ in Eq. (37) we have now unitary equivalent operators $(\hat{u} - \lambda)^T (\hat{u} - \lambda)$, due to which with use of the lower boundary (17) after replacing $\hat{\mathcal{E}}$ to $\hat{\tilde{\mathcal{E}}}$ we immediately get the solution in the form of Eq. (19) where projectors $\hat{P}(\lambda)$ correspond to minimal eigen value r_0 of operators $(\hat{u} - \lambda)^T (\hat{u} - \lambda)$:

$$(\hat{u} - \lambda)^T (\hat{u} - \lambda) \hat{P}(\lambda) = r_0 \hat{P}(\lambda). \quad (39)$$

Corresponding measure ν is to be found from the normalization condition (38) which results in equation

$$\int \hat{P}(\tilde{\lambda}) \nu(d\tilde{\lambda}) = \hat{\rho}. \quad (40)$$

If the equation

$$\tilde{K}_u - \frac{1}{2}|C_u| > 0 \quad (41)$$

holds, then on account of that $\hat{P}(\lambda)$ is a family of the gaussian density matrices with the correlation matrix $K_0 = (1/2)|C_u|$ (see Sec. III), from Eq. (40) we get measure ν in the form of the gaussian probability measure

$$\nu(d\tilde{\lambda}) = \det^{-1/2} \left[2\pi \left(\tilde{K}_u - \frac{1}{2}|C_u| \right) \right] \exp \left[-\frac{1}{2} \tilde{\lambda}^T \left(\tilde{K}_u - \frac{1}{2}|C_u| \right)^{-1} \tilde{\lambda} \right] d\tilde{\lambda}. \quad (42)$$

Expressing the original measure $\hat{\mathcal{E}}_0$ via the above discussed extreme measure $\hat{\mathcal{E}}_0$ in accordance with Eq. (36) we get the optimal quantum decision function

$$\hat{\mathcal{E}}_0(d\tilde{\lambda}) = \hat{\rho}^{-1/2} \hat{P}(\tilde{\lambda}) \hat{\rho}^{-1/2} \nu(d\tilde{\lambda}). \quad (43)$$

It is capable to interpret this solution in a simpler equivalent form. For this purpose let us take into account that projectors $\hat{P}(\tilde{\lambda})$ are of the form $\psi(\tilde{\lambda})\psi^+(\tilde{\lambda})$, where $\psi(\tilde{\lambda})$ are normalized ‘‘Glauber’’ eigen vectors of the operators $(\hat{u} - \tilde{\lambda})^T (\hat{u} - \tilde{\lambda})$. Then

$$\hat{P}(\tilde{\lambda}) = [\text{Tr} \hat{\rho}^{-1} \hat{P}(\tilde{\lambda})]^{-1} \hat{\rho}^{-1/2} \hat{P}(\tilde{\lambda}) \hat{\rho}^{-1/2} \quad (44)$$

are also projectors of the form

$$\hat{P}(\tilde{\lambda}) = \varphi(\tilde{\lambda}) \varphi^+(\tilde{\lambda}) \quad \left(\varphi = (\psi^+ \hat{\rho}^{-1} \psi)^{-1/2} \hat{\rho}^{-1/2} \psi \right).$$

They are, as it is easy to show after multiplication of Eq. (39) both on the left and right by $\hat{\rho}^{-1/2}$ and applying twice the commutation rule [7] $\hat{\rho}^{-1/2} \hat{u} = \exp(-C_u \tilde{Q}_u) \hat{u} \hat{\rho}^{-1/2}$ ($\tilde{Q}_u = V^{-1T} \tilde{Q} V^{-1}$), the eigen projectors of a new generally non-Hermitian quadratic form:

$$[\exp(-C_u Q_u) \hat{u} - \tilde{\lambda}]^T [\exp(-C_u Q_u) \hat{u} - \tilde{\lambda}] \hat{P}(\tilde{\lambda}) = r_0 \hat{P}(\tilde{\lambda}). \quad (45)$$

Here again, like in Eq. (39),

$$r_0 = \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr} |C_u|.$$

From Eq. (45) it is easy to get that asymptotically with $C_u \rightarrow 0$ projectors $\hat{P}(\tilde{\lambda})$ and $\hat{\tilde{P}}(\tilde{\lambda})$ coincide. With use of $\hat{\tilde{P}}(\tilde{\lambda})$ Eq. (43) takes the form

$$\hat{\mathcal{E}}_0(d\tilde{\lambda}) = \hat{\tilde{P}}(\tilde{\lambda}) \tilde{\nu}(d\tilde{\lambda}), \quad (46)$$

where measure $\tilde{\nu}$ may be calculated also with use of normalization condition (5) (the second relation). At the limit $C_u \rightarrow 0$ Eq. (46) differs from optimal measure $\hat{\mathcal{E}}_0$, calculated in Sec. III for the case of simple cost function, by the change $\hat{x} \rightarrow \hat{u}$ and applying the corresponding definitions for the projectors $\hat{P}(\tilde{\lambda})$ and commutation matrix C . Hence, the responding optimal measurement procedures are also identical.

If condition (41) does not hold then Eq. (42) is not applicable. Not going into detailed analysis of this case, we simply mark here, that its qualitative specificity may be revealed by analysis of the transition from the non-degenerate matrix $\tilde{K}_u - (1/2)|C_u|$ to the degenerate one. At that, over one or several linear combinations of variables $\hat{u}$ measure (42) will be localized at zero (it is the a priori mathematical expectation). This means that the corresponding variables do not need refinement on the base of available information. If matrix $\tilde{K}_u - (1/2)|C_u|$ is not positive than, from the physical qualitative considerations which are supplied with corresponding mathematical analysis, it is clear that the above described degeneration persists.

V. METHOD OF INFORMATION CONSTRAINTS

This method is based [8] on reducing, with use of a small additional term, the linear optimization problem (7) and (5) (the second relation) to an appropriate non-linear one which lets using the standard differential variation methods. Like in [8] it is possible here to use for this purpose the entropy defined an appropriate way as

$$H(\hat{\mathcal{E}}) = \int \text{Tr } \hat{\mathcal{E}}(d\tilde{\lambda}) \ln \frac{\hat{\mathcal{E}}(d\tilde{\lambda})}{\nu(d\tilde{\lambda})}. \quad (47)$$

This expression defines entropy of the relative operator measure $\hat{\mathcal{E}}$ with respect to the scalar measure ν . It generalizes usual definition $H^{\mu/\nu} = \int d\mu \ln \frac{d\mu}{d\nu}$ of the relative entropy of the scalar measure μ with respect to ν . Measure ν in Eq. (47) is to be chosen such a way that the optimal measure $\hat{\mathcal{E}}_0$ should be absolutely continuous with respect to ν ; to fit this condition it is possible to apply the standard measure $\nu(d\tilde{\lambda}) = d\tilde{\lambda}$.

Basing on these considerations, let us switch from the minimization problem (7) to the “regularized” problem

$$\mathcal{R}_\varepsilon(\hat{\mathcal{E}}) = \mathcal{R}(\hat{\mathcal{E}}) + \varepsilon H(\hat{\mathcal{E}}) = \min_{\hat{\mathcal{E}}} \quad (48)$$

where $\varepsilon > 0$ is a small parameter similar to the one used in Appendix A and analogous to a physical temperature; $\mathcal{R}(\hat{\mathcal{E}})$ is an analogue of the average energy of thermodynamics and $H(\hat{\mathcal{E}})$ is analogue of the entropy. On the total, the problem (48) is analogous to the one of the statistical physics involved with the deducing of the Gibbs distribution from the minimization of the average energy at the condition of the fixed entropy value. However, this problem differs from the thermodynamical one by the operator-valued measure $\hat{\mathcal{E}}$ and the normalization condition (5) (the second relation). The solution $\hat{\mathcal{E}}_\varepsilon$ of the problem (48) on account of the normalization condition (5) (the second relation) is easy to get with use of the Lagrange multipliers in the form of Gibbs-like distribution

$$\hat{\mathcal{E}}_\varepsilon(d\tilde{\lambda}) = \exp \left[\frac{\hat{F}_\varepsilon - \hat{R}(\tilde{\lambda})}{\varepsilon} \right] \nu(d\tilde{\lambda}). \quad (49)$$

Here an undefined operator $\hat{F}$ is an operator analogue of a c -number free energy $\varepsilon\Gamma(\varepsilon)$ in a quantum Gibbs distribution $\hat{\rho} = \exp[\Gamma(\varepsilon) - \hat{\mathcal{H}}/\varepsilon]$. It is calculated to fit the operator normalization condition

$$\int \exp \left[\frac{\hat{F} - \hat{R}(\tilde{\lambda})}{\varepsilon} \right] \nu(d\tilde{\lambda}) = \hat{I}. \quad (50)$$

If the solution $\hat{F}(\varepsilon)$ of this equation is acquired the strictly optimal measure $\hat{\mathcal{E}}_0$ can be found by calculation of the limit $\hat{\mathcal{E}}_0 = \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \hat{\mathcal{E}}_\varepsilon$. Corresponding to Eq. (49) entropy $H = H(\hat{\mathcal{E}}_\varepsilon)$ and average risk $\mathcal{R} = \mathcal{R}(\hat{\mathcal{E}}_\varepsilon)$ can be expressed via $\hat{F}(\varepsilon)$ by formulas which are analogous to the thermodynamical ones:

$$H = \text{Tr } \frac{d\hat{F}}{d\varepsilon}, \quad \mathcal{R} = \text{Tr } \hat{F} - \varepsilon H.$$

(To prove this equation one can use the equality $\frac{d}{d\varepsilon} \text{Tr } \ln \int \hat{\mathcal{E}}_\varepsilon(d\tilde{\lambda}) = 0$, which is valid due to the normalization condition.)

At this method the major complication is transferred to the operator equation (50) for the free energy operator $\hat{F}$. If operator

$$\hat{F}_0 = \varepsilon \ln \int \exp \left[-\frac{\hat{R}(\tilde{\lambda})}{\varepsilon} \right] \nu(d\tilde{\lambda})$$

does repeatedly commute with all operators $\hat{R}(\tilde{\lambda})$, that is

$$[[\hat{R}(\tilde{\lambda}), \hat{F}_0], \hat{R}(\tilde{\lambda})] = [[\hat{R}(\tilde{\lambda}), \hat{F}_0], \hat{F}_0] = 0$$

for all $\tilde{\lambda}$, then it is a solution of Eq. (50). It is easy to check substituting $\hat{F}_0$ into Eq. (50) and using formula $\exp(\hat{A} + \hat{B}) = \exp(\hat{B}/2) \exp(\hat{A}) \exp(\hat{B}/2)$ for repeatedly commuting operators $\hat{A}$ and $\hat{B}$. Exactly to this situation all the problems of Sec. III, IV can be reduced. Another possible application of this method may be obtaining approximate solutions with use of numeric calculations.

VI. PHYSICAL MEASUREMENT PROCEDURE

Let us confine to the case of quantum decision function

$$\hat{\mathcal{E}}(d\tilde{\lambda}) = \hat{P}(\tilde{\lambda}) \frac{d\tilde{\lambda}}{\det^{1/2}|2\pi C|}, \quad (51)$$

where $\hat{P}(\tilde{\lambda})$ are “vacuum” projectors for operators $(\hat{x} - \tilde{\lambda})^T(\hat{x} - \tilde{\lambda})$ which are quadratic on $\hat{x}$: $[\hat{x}, \hat{x}^T] = C\hat{I}$. As it follows from Sec. III, IV, this function is optimal for the case of the simple cost function and wide a’priori distribution and for the case of quadratic cost function (when $\hat{x} = \hat{u}$) and weak non-commutativity. Let us show that the directly measured variables $\hat{\Theta} = \int \tilde{\lambda} \hat{E}(d\tilde{\lambda})$ have the form

$$\hat{\Theta} = \hat{x} + B\hat{\xi}, \quad (52)$$

where operators $\hat{\xi}$ are copies of $\hat{x}$ in a space H' a copy of the space H , and B fits the equation

$$BCB^T = -C. \quad (53)$$

The state $\hat{\rho}'$ of the additional system is

$$\hat{\rho}' = \hat{P}'(0) \quad (54)$$

where $\hat{P}'(0)$ is a copy of $\hat{P}(0)$.

The proof is given by check of the commutativity of the operators (52) and validness of the Eq. (4). For the commutator $C_{\Theta} = [\hat{\Theta}, \hat{\Theta}^T]$ on account of Eq. (53) we have $C_{\vartheta} = C + BCB^T = 0$. Then on account of the commutativity of $\hat{\Theta}$ we have

$$\hat{E}(d\tilde{\lambda}) = \delta(d\tilde{\lambda}, \hat{\Theta}) = \delta(d\tilde{\lambda}, \hat{x} + B\hat{\xi}) = (2\pi)^{-s} \int \exp[i\boldsymbol{\varkappa}^T(\hat{x} + B\hat{\xi} - \tilde{\lambda})] d\boldsymbol{\varkappa} d\tilde{\lambda}.$$

Substituting this expression into Eq. (4), where on account of Eq. (54) is to be represented as Fourier integral $\hat{\rho}' = (2\pi)^{-s} \int \pi(i\tilde{\varkappa}) e^{i\tilde{\varkappa}\hat{\xi}} d\tilde{\varkappa}$. Then we get

$$\text{Tr}_{H'} \hat{E}(d\tilde{\lambda}) \hat{\rho}' = d\tilde{\lambda} (2\pi)^{-2s} \iint \pi(i\tilde{\varkappa}) e^{i\boldsymbol{\varkappa}^T(\hat{x} - \tilde{\lambda})} \text{Tr}_{H'} e^{i\boldsymbol{\varkappa}^T B\hat{\xi} + i\tilde{\varkappa}^T \hat{\xi}} d\boldsymbol{\varkappa} d\tilde{\varkappa},$$

where the commutativity of $\hat{x}$ and $\hat{\xi}$ and possibility of confluence of the exponents of repeatedly commuting operators under the Tr operation are taken into account. Applying formula $\text{Tr} \exp(i\mu^T \hat{x}) = (2\pi)^s \det^{-1/2}|2\pi C| \delta(\mu)$ (which is easy to prove, e.g. with use of the zero temperature method) and performing integration over $\tilde{\varkappa}$ we get, on account of the symmetry of $\pi(i\boldsymbol{\varkappa})$ and the relation $|\det B| = 1$ valid due to Eq. (53), we get

$$\text{Tr}_{H'} \hat{E}(d\tilde{\lambda}) \hat{\rho}' = (2\pi)^{-s} \det^{-1/2} \int \pi(iB^T \boldsymbol{\varkappa}) e^{i\boldsymbol{\varkappa}^T B(\hat{x} - \tilde{\lambda})} \frac{d\boldsymbol{\varkappa} d\tilde{\lambda}}{\det^{1/2}|2\pi C|} = \hat{P}(\tilde{\lambda}) \frac{d\tilde{\lambda}}{\det^{1/2}|2\pi C|}.$$

Thus, the presented measurement procedure matches the decision function (51), Q. E. D.

APPENDIX A: PROOF OF THE SUGGESTED PROPERTIES OF THE FAMILY $\hat{\rho}(\lambda)$ FOR AN UNLIMITEDLY WIDE VOLUME $\tilde{\Lambda} \ni \lambda$

Now let us prove the above suggested properties of the family $\{\hat{\rho}(\lambda), \lambda \in \tilde{\Lambda}_i\}$ for an unlimitedly expanding volumes $\tilde{\Lambda}_i \ni \lambda, \delta\Lambda_i$. The statements are equal to the relations

$$\lim(\hat{P}_i \hat{P}_j - \delta_{ij} \hat{P}_i) = 0, \quad (A1)$$

$$\lim \hat{\rho}(\lambda) \hat{P}_i = \delta_{ij} \hat{\rho}(\lambda) \quad \text{for } \lambda \in \tilde{\Lambda}_j. \quad (A2)$$

The first one means that Eq. (24) defines projectors onto mutually orthogonal subspaces Φ_i , and the second one is the condition of the non-trivial action of operators $\hat{\rho}(\lambda)$ only in the subspaces Φ_i corresponding to $\tilde{\Lambda}_i \ni \lambda$.

The proof of the Eqs. (A1) and (A2) for $i \neq j$ is capable to obtain, basing on the explicit expressions of the eigen functions $\psi_0(\lambda)$, which may be used to represent the projectors in the form $\hat{P}(\lambda) = \psi_0(\lambda)\psi_0^+(\lambda)$ (this functions are frequently called “coherent” or “Glauber” states: for a two-dimensional, or — in other terms — single-mode case $s = 2$ the explicit form of $\psi_0(\lambda)$ is given, for example, in Ref. [6]).

Vectors $\psi_0(\lambda)$ are asymptotically orthogonal to the eigen functions $\psi_n(\lambda')$ of operators $\hat{\rho}(\lambda')$ ($n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$) if the distance $\lambda' - \lambda$ with respect to the norm of commutator C increases to infinity. This is exactly the case of unlimited expansion of $\delta\Lambda_i$. In the case $i = j$ in (A1) and (A2) operators $\hat{P}_j$ should be represented with the formula (24) and, on account of the above discussion, the integration extended to the whole space Λ . Then $\hat{P}_j$ will be changed to non-orthogonal expansion of unit in the whole space H :

$$\hat{I} = \int_{\Lambda} \hat{P}(\lambda) \frac{d\lambda}{\det^{1/2}|2\pi C|}. \quad (\text{A3})$$

To get the proof, it is most convenient to use the zero temperature method. For this case it comes to representation of projectors $\hat{P}(\lambda)$ in the form of the limit

$$\hat{P}(\lambda) = \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \hat{\rho}_{\varepsilon}(\lambda) \quad (\text{A4})$$

of the density matrix

$$\hat{\rho}_{\varepsilon} = \exp \left[\Gamma(\varepsilon) - \frac{(\hat{x} - \lambda)^T (\hat{x} - \lambda)}{\varepsilon} \right], \quad (\text{A5})$$

which is a canonical Gibbs distribution for a thermodynamic system with Hamiltonian $(\hat{x} - \lambda)^T (\hat{x} - \lambda)$ and temperature $\varepsilon = kT$. Let us substitute Eq. (A4) into Eq. (A3) and replace there $d\lambda$ by the gaussian measure $\mu(d\lambda) = \exp(-\lambda^T K_{\mu}^{-1} \lambda / 2) d\lambda$, which differs from the probability one by absence of the normalizing multiplier $\det^{-1/2}(2\pi K_{\mu})$ and falls to $d\lambda$ at the limit $K_{\mu} \rightarrow \infty$. Then the modified integral is proportional to marginal density matrix $\tilde{\rho}(\varepsilon, K_{\mu})$ (with the proportionality coefficient $\det^{1/2}(2\pi K_{\mu}) / \det^{1/2}|2\pi C|$ absent) of the part $\hat{x}$ of the gaussian collection $(\hat{x}, \lambda)$ with the joint quantum-classical probability distribution $\hat{\rho}_{\varepsilon}(\lambda) \det^{-1/2}(2\pi K_{\mu}) \mu(d\lambda)$. Density matrix $\tilde{\rho}(\varepsilon, K_{\mu})$ is gaussian and its calculation algorithm reduces first, in accordance to [7], to calculation of the correlation matrix $\tilde{K} = K_{\varepsilon} + K_{\mu}$, where in accordance to Eq. (11) $K_{\varepsilon} = (1/2)C \coth QC \approx |C|/2$, then calculation from Eq. (11) the corresponding matrix

$$\tilde{Q} = C^{-1} \coth^{-1}(2\tilde{K}C^{-1}) \approx (1/2)K_{\mu}^{-1},$$

and with use of Eq. (10) — the corresponding normalization constant

$$e^{\tilde{\Gamma}} = \det^{1/2}|2 \sinh(\tilde{Q}C)| \approx \det^{1/2}|2\pi C| / \det^{1/2}(2\pi K_{\mu}).$$

Finally, for the integral of interest we get

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Lambda} \hat{P}(\lambda) \frac{d\lambda}{\det^{1/2}|2\pi C|} &= \lim_{K_{\mu} \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{\det^{1/2}(2\pi K_{\mu})}{\det^{1/2}|2\pi C|} \int_{\Lambda} \hat{\rho}_{\varepsilon}(\lambda) \frac{\mu(d\lambda)}{\det^{1/2}(2\pi K_{\mu})} = \\ &= \lim_{K_{\mu} \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{\det^{1/2}(2\pi K_{\mu})}{\det^{1/2}|2\pi C|} \tilde{\rho}(\varepsilon, K_{\mu}) = \lim_{K_{\mu} \rightarrow \infty} \exp \left(-\frac{1}{2} \hat{x}^T K_{\mu}^{-1} \hat{x} \right) = \hat{I}. \end{aligned}$$

This proves Eq. (A3) and completes the validation of the above presented solution.

Submitted 18 I 1972

[1] Helstrom C. W., Liu J. W. S. and Gordon J. P., “Quantum mechanical communication theory”, *Trans. IEEE* **58**, pp. 1578–1598 (1970).

- [2] Bolshakov I. A. et al, *Mathematical foundations of the modern radio-electronics* ("Sov. Radio", Moscow, 1968, in Russian).
- [3] Akhiezer N. I. and Glazman I. M., *Theory of linear operators in the Hilbert space* ("Nauka", Moscow, 1966, in Russian).
- [4] Holevo A. S., "Statistical problems in quantum physics", Second Japan–USSR symposium on probability theory, Kyoto, August 1972.
- [5] Grishanin B. A., "Some methods and results of quantum decision theory", V-th Conf. on coding and inf. transf. theory, Moscow–Gorkii, October 1972, vol. III (in Russian).
- [6] Klauder J. R. and Sudarshan E. C. G., *Fundamentals of quantum optics* (W. A. Benjamin inc, New-York–Amsterdam, 1968).
- [7] Grishanin B. A. and Stratonovich R. L., "Optimal filtering of quantum variables at the quadratic quality criterion", *Problemi peredachi informatsii* **6**(3), pp. 15–23 (1970).
- [8] Grishanin B. A. and Mamaev D. D., "An information-theoretic method for construction of adaptive algorithms for solution of game problems," *Engineering Cybernetics* ("Tekhnicheskaya Kibernetika") **8**(6), pp. 1031–1038 (1970).